This book is a welcome addition to literature on the replication and reproduction of national elite education in different parts of the world. It derived, in part from an international symposium on ‘Private and Elite Education’ held at the Institute of Education, University of London (now a part of University College London, UCL) in November 2012. It therefore has a distinct link to UCL Institute of Education. It is edited by Claire Maxwell, a reader in sociology at UCL Institute of Education, and Peter Aggleton, a professor in education at UNSW Australia, although he is also a visiting professorial fellow in education at UCL Institute of Education.

The editors, who have previously written jointly about ‘elite’ girls’ education (Maxwell and Aggleton, 2015), have assembled a diverse set of writers, including the distinguished Stephen J. Ball, the Karl Mannheim professor of sociology of education at UCL Institute of Education. Three other authors are based in the United Kingdom (UK), but the remaining authors are based in higher education institutions outside the UK, scattered as far afield as Brazil, Singapore and Australia. A significant number of the writers are based in Scandinavia. The author in this book who is most likely to be familiar with readers of this journal is Julia Resnik, senior lecturer in sociology of education at the School of Education, Hebrew University of Jerusalem. She has written previously about the growth of the International Baccalaureate (IB) programmes (e.g. Resnik, 2009; and 2012a).

From the outset, it is explained by the editors that they acknowledge ‘education is now a transnational business’ (Maxwell and Aggleton, 2015 p.3), but the intention of the 2012 symposium was to focus on the national context in order to allow in-depth case-studies of ‘elite education’ in different localities. This immediately limits its appeal to international educationalists who might wish a broader, less focused analysis. However, the case-studies are of interest and value, and reveal much about how ‘elite education’ differs across nation-states, and regions of the world. The book describes itself as being a major publication. The back-page ‘blurb’ claims it is ‘the first book to systematically examine elite education in different parts of the world’, and offers ‘a benchmark perspective on issues frequently glossed over in comparative education.’ Although I do not know if this claim is totally true, it is in my mind a unique collection of thought and perspective. In my view, it offers a complementary research source to The Routledge International Handbook of the Sociology of Education (Apple, Ball and Gandin, 2009).

In total, 23 authors ‘provide a historical analysis of the emergence of national elite education systems.’ The book provides in-depth country-level case studies, including China, Nigeria, Australia, Brazil, France, Germany, Finland, England and Scotland. It is a very wide-range of case studies. In total, 13 countries are surveyed. It identifies its appeal as being towards ‘policymakers and academics in the field of education and sociology’, and is aimed specifically at postgraduate-level studies. The book is divided into three clear and distinct sections. Aside from an introductory and concluding chapters, there is a section on ‘Developments in the Anglophone world: England, Scotland, Australia and North America’, followed by a section on ‘European perspectives: similarities and differences in Scandinavia, France and Germany’. The third section is about ‘Emerging financial powers in Latin America, Asia and Africa’.

Chapter 5 by Stephen J. Ball, as one might expect, offers much food for thought. Ball discusses and comments upon ‘the future of elite research in education’, and the chapter is a good complementary one to other recent comment (e.g. Dolby, 2012; Resnik, 2012b; Kenway and
Howard, 2013; Lauder, 2015). Ball states that the field of research in ‘elite education’ is quite new and concludes that more attention is needed on the issue of relationships between elites, rather than focusing on the reproduction of elites within individual nation-states. We know quite a lot about how elites are formed, but how do they relate to each other, and interact? Also, Ball is critical of the way that research and discussion on ‘elite education’ tends to focus on the negative implications of inequality and ‘disadvantage’ rather than trying to understand and explain the reproduction of ‘advantage’. This is an area that researchers in ‘international education’ could actively engage in, and offer answers. The chapter by Resnik (Chapter 15) adds to this point, arguing that a fruitful avenue for future research might involve the use of actor-network theory (ANT); ‘the study of international education through a network approach may open up new avenues form research on elite education and include questions that transcend locality’ (Resnik, 2015 p.189). There does seem a need to undergo more longitudinal study, tracking life-trajectories of those who have had an ‘elite education’, focusing perhaps on the extent to which they make use of their networks. Such a research agenda is put forward in the concluding chapter of the book (Maxwell and Aggleton, 2015 p.194).

Moving forward with the critique, I found the title of the book rather misleading. The sub-title ‘International Perspectives’ implies that it involves academics around the world offering an international perspective i.e. a Chinese academic based in China offering a Chinese perspective on elite education. Yet, it is actually a set of ‘comparative perspectives’. Also, the sub-title ‘Sociological Perspectives’ might have been more appropriate. A glance at the Index shows an abundance of references to ‘class reproduction’, ‘cultural capital’ and ‘inequalities’. This is perhaps unsurprising given the fact that most of the authors have a background in sociology of education.

I was surprised to find little reference to elite education in an African context, beyond Nigeria. The Middle East was also conspicuously absent, which will be a disappointment to many readers of this journal who are perhaps increasingly interested, like myself, in developments in nation-states such as United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia and Qatar. Moreover, the book makes little direct reference to the forces of ‘international education’, a by-product of the fact it is largely written by sociologists of education rather than international educationalists. The Index offers only five references to the ‘International Baccalaureate’ in general, plus a couple of references to IB activity in Argentina, Scotland and Sweden. This seems surprising given the scope of the book. Further, the Index has only one direct reference to ‘international education’, and just four references to ‘international schools’ (mainly in Chapter 8 about ‘elite education in Germany).

What I found most surprising was the lack of attention given to the emergence of replicated and exported English private education (Bunnell, 2008). The issue of ‘elite education’ does seem quite topical, and the internationalization of ‘elite’ private schools has been recently discussed (e.g. Brooks and Waters, 2014). The book had one reference to Harrow School, in Chapter 11 about elite education in China, referring to the fact that Harrow has ‘several international schools in several Asian cities, including Beijing’ (Yang, 2016 p.144). However, the discussion about ‘international education’ in Chapter 11 consisted of only five lines. Otherwise, the growth of branded overseas branches of ‘elite’ schools, not just from England but Canada (e.g. Branksome Hall Asia) and United States (e.g. Dwight School Shanghai) also, has been largely ignored, or overlooked, by the book. In short, the book may offer ‘international perspectives’, but it is short on ‘global perspectives’.
The book reveals the complexity and vagueness of the term ‘elite education’, and offers some useful frameworks for researchers in the area. The term ‘elites’ defies exact description. Who exactly are the ‘elite’? In what way is the education they receive an ‘elite’ one? Readers of this journal will be familiar with the complexity of the term ‘international education’ and the extent to which it defies exact definition, and is often conceptualized (e.g. Tate, 2012) as an umbrella term for numerous other associated terms, which may or may not fit together within a Venn-type diagram. The chapter on ‘elite education in Sweden’ (Chapter 7) sets a similar scene when it refers to ‘three definitions of elite education’, alongside ‘four ways to study elite education’. The authors of the chapter conclude that: ‘We have found it useful to differentiate between three definitions of elite education’ (Borjesson et al. 2016 p.101). They identify these as being a ‘meritocratic’ definition, a ‘social’ one, plus a ‘functional’ one. Few other authors in the book attempt such a definition, or present a model for conceptualizing a definition, although Resnik (2015 p.188) does note the significant point that the term ‘elite education’ is used differently in the global south where it is more closely linked to the provision of English-language education, an issue of relevance to ‘international education’. Ball (2015 p.70) explains that the term ‘elite’ is a floating signifier whilst there is ‘clearly no single or agreed usage or definition of the term’. The chapters in the book reaffirm the validity of this view.

A major conclusion to be drawn from the book is the way that research and discussion on ‘elite education’ is (still) dominated by a lens of inquiry involving the works of the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (e.g. concepts such as ‘habitus’ and ‘social capital’). Discussions about the growth of ‘international schooling’ also make much reference to the work of Bourdieu (e.g. Bailey, 2015) and it has become a staple ingredient of the literature recipe. A glance at the Index of the book reveals 28 direct references to Bourdieu. The editors of the book are aware of this issue, and within the concluding chapter they admit that: ‘Bourdieu’s work continues to dominate much of the field’ and his work might be ‘extended and re-interpreted (Maxwell and Aggleton, 2015 p.194). Looking beyond Bourdieu, it is suggested that future research ought to try to extend ‘the kinds of theoretical concepts and tools that are drawn upon when researching elite education’ (Maxwell and Aggleton, 2015 p.194). The issue of networks and ‘elite spaces’ is offered as possible new fields of inquiry. However, the issue of ‘life beyond Bourdieu’ is never really grasped. Resnik’s chapter also raises the issue of ‘over-reliance on Bourdieu’, and in discussing the limitations of Bourdieu’s theories Resnik also advocates moving towards a network approach, looking at flows of ‘elite education’ rather than locality. This is arguably where the case study of replicated and exported branded English private education would be useful; as the book notes, one can now receive a Harrow School type-education in Beijing without having to move to north London.

This leads to a final conclusion that what is really needed is a series of such books, looking at ‘elite education’ from perhaps a historical perspective, or a philosophical one. The term ‘elite’ can be viewed from a number of alternative perspectives (e.g. privilege, social justice, rights, responsibilities etc.). A political economy perspective might also useful, helping to bring in new and alternative theories and theorists. The discussion does seem at present to be limited to a sociological perspective, where the work of Bourdieu, and to a lesser extent Foucault dominate the lens of inquiry. Furthermore, a distinct ‘international education’ perspective would help to bring in issues of flows of ‘elite education’, moving the discussion beyond a static national setting towards a fluid globalised one (e.g. Wright and Lee, 2014; Tarc and Mishra Tarc, 2015; Hallgarten et al, 2015; Lee and Wright, 2016). It would also bring in areas
of the world currently largely ‘flying below the radar’, such as Abu Dhabi, Dubai, India, Kazakhstan, Myanmar and Qatar. Furthermore, it would bring in international networks of ‘elite’ schools (e.g. GEMS Education), and intended future networks (e.g. Avenues: The World School), that have also largely escaped scholarly attention or critical discussion.
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